DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 487 IR 007 988

AUTHOR Deffenbaugh, James T.
TITLE Library Faculty Salary Survey: Preliminary and Final Reports.
INSTITUTION American Association of Univ. Professors, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries: Library Surveys: *Professional Personnel: *Salaries: Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *University of Notre Dame IN

ABSTRACT

The first of these two reports by the Library Faculty Affairs Committee compares the findings of a survey of library faculty salaries at the University of Notre Dame with statistics reported by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL)--based on 94 libraries--and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) for 1557 libraries, as well as with average salaries by rank for teaching faculty at Notre Dame. The second report summarizes the findings of this survey and reports the main conclusion reached by the committee--that the N.D. library faculty should take no action as a group for salary enhancement of professional library positions. The reasons for this recommendation are discussed in some detail, and other related issues are noted. Appendices include tables showing average salaries by region for ARI libraries and weighted average salary by rank and AAUP classification for 1977-78. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180487

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR

LIBRARY FACULTY SALARY SURVEY:

PRELIMINARY AND FINAL REPORTS

Library Faculty Affairs Committee

James T. Deffenbaugh, Chmn.

Reprinted with permission of the
American Association of University
Professors from the December 1978,
Academe

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James T. Deffenbaugh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR007988

LIBRARIANS' SALARY SURVEY: PRELIMINARY REPORT

Forward

Two library faculty meetings ago, we discussed the present salary survey project of the Library Faculty Affairs Committee. It was the consensus at that time to accept the committee's recommendation to move independently of the Faculty Senate's salary survey, which for reasons we need not cite here is presently going nownere.

Perhaps the greatest advantage of conducting our own survey separately from the Faculty Senate survey is that we no longer need to class librarians by academic rank (i.e., staff librarian, assistant librarian, etc.) in order to integrate our salary figures into theirs. Statistics on librarians' salaries by academic rank are generally unavailable (We found none in the library literature). Ranking of librarians is not universal in academic libaries; and often when the names of the ranks are the same, they mean different things in different places. Clearly, the most significant statistics now commonly available on academic librarians' salaries classify librarians not by academic rank but by function served in the library.

We wish to present in this preliminary report a variety of such statistical measurements. Frankly, professional salaries at N.D. Libraries appear better or worse depending upon what statistical charts they are fitted into. Though we will save our recommendations for our final report, we do hope to point out some noteworthy findings here.

Report

NOTRE DAME PROFESSIONAL SALARIES
Ranking among ARL Libraries*
1977-78

Beginning	($11200)	31st (out of 94)
Median	($14100)	77th "
Average	($16647)	46th "

1978-79

Beginning	($11200)	54th (out of 94)-corrected figures
Median	($14796)	81st (out of 94)
Average	NA	

Several points should be noted here. The first is the difference between average and median. The average is derived by adding up all the salaries of professionals working in a library and then dividing that sum by the number of full-time-equivalent positions. The median is slightly more complicated: it is the salary figure exactly at the midpoint of salary distribution; in other words, half the librarians make more than the median salary and half make less. The average salary may tend to be higher than the median in most smaller organizations, since the higher salaries of administrators tend to raise the average somewhat above the figure which is midpoint on the salary distribution scale. This is the case with Notre Dame and all other ARL academic libraries. However, the committee did note that the difference between the median and average salaries in 1977 here at Notre Dame was greater, often much greater--$2500--than at most other ARL libraries.

Furthermore, it should be observed that the 1978-79 figure given in the ARL report for the beginning salary at Notre Dame was incorrect: it stated the sum at $12096,though the starting pay

*ARL. Annual Salary Survey 1977-1978, pp.11-14.

in 78-79 actually remains the same as the preceding year, $11200. The ranking of 54th out of 94 for beginning salary in 78-79 was computed with the corrected figures. This error does make one wonder how many other mistakes are in the report, and how much the rankings have thus been affected.

The N.D. library salary rankings generally appear rather grim, though it is clear that the beginning salary, especially in 77-78, is more competitive than the median salary. The low salary ranking in this over-all ARL salary scale, however, tends to fit in with low N.D.Libraries rankings in other ARL statistics (e.g., books added), recently published in the Chronicle of Higher Education.

* * *

These low rankings on the over-all salary chart appear in a curious light, however, when one looks at Table 7 of the same ARL report (See Appendix 1 attached), which contains 77-78 figures.

So that this table could be compared with N.D. salary figures, the committee requested and received form Library Director Robert Miller a similar chart indicating N.D. library faculty average salaries according to function or experience, for both 77-78 and 78-79. Of course, the request was in regard only to group averages, since the committee believes it neither generally proper nor desirable for our project to acquire salary information on specific individuals. Mr. Miller's chart varied from ARL report Table 7 only in the following ways: the director's salary was not included; department head salaries (cataloging, collection management, collection development, acquisitions, reference, and college library)

were not listed by department but given in one average sum; and the section for branch libraries specifically noted six units (architecture, chem/physics, international studies, life sciences, medieval institute, and rare books/special collections). A further stipulation was that assistant department heads are classed as "Other" in the N.D. chart.

In almost all areas, the 78-79 N.D. average salaries for the various levels of library position were either virtually the same as or a little greater than the figures given for the east north central region in ARL table 7 (The committee assumed that this region, the one of which Notre Dame is geopraphically a part, is the most logical group for comparison, especially since that region includes a varied cross-section of academic libraries--n.b. the bottom half of the page). The similarity of salary figures is especially striking when it is noted that table 7 presents 77-78 averages. In other words, in 78-79, N.D. salary averages are in almost all categories what the east north central ARL averages were in 77-78. We are generally one year behind them. In terms of percentage, we are approximately 8% behind them. This fiscal year's 8% increase in library faculty salaties gave us parity minus one year.

There are two areas, however, where this parity minus one year rating does not exist: branch library heads and senior librarians who fit into the category, "Other." In these levels, Notre Dame is substantially more than one year behind the averages given in the east north central region in ARL table 7.

We did not determine as a committee why these two areas are

lower than the others. At least three possibilities exist: either there is some built-in injustice in our salary structure; or we are not comparable to other east north central ARL libraries for these levels of librarianship; or there are mitigating circumstances in individual cases. Perhaps all three may play a part. To ascertain how much and/or which of these possibilities have a direct effect on the lower than average salary ratings in these particula levels, the committee would have to deal with individual cases. And we believe that such an enterprise is not a matter for the committee, but for the library administration.

* * *

The ARL statistics (for 94 libraries) present a somewhat mixed picture. Neither side of the picture is particularly upbeat. But one side seems better than the other. The over-all salary scale ranks us in the bottom 15% of ARL libraries for median salary in 78-79; on the other hand, we are, with some exceptions, only "one year behind" in Table 7. At any rate, the committee does not wish to restrict our report to ARL statistics. So we include (in Appendix 2 attached) a statistical table compiled by the AAUP (for 1557 libraries) and included in the December 1978 issue of their publication, Academe.

Clearly, the mode of measurement and classification is different from that of the ARL tables. But if one knows that 78-79 N.D. averages are very similar to the figures in ARL table 7 in most areas, then one knows enough to estimate with reasonable certainty that we compare favorably in the AAUP survey presented in Appendix 2.

The notable figure in this survey, however, does not directly concern this committee. But we wish to bring it to your attention. It is the salary given, in any of the four tables presented, for TCO (technical, clerical, and other supporting staff on the library budget) in Category I. We speculate that all but very few of the staff members here at N.D. Libraries are paid considerably less than the Category I TCO level in even the lowest-paid table, the Church-related institutions. The committee recommends that a study be done to ascertain the facts of this matter, and then that attempts be made to rectify the situation if it is as bad as it appears to be.

* * *

There are those who believe that, in any study of whether an academic library faculty has a strong case for salary increases, the most significant comparison is not with other academic librarians but with the teaching faculty served by the library faculty in question. This can only be done if the academic ranks of librarians are used, since the parallel with academic ranks of teaching faculty is obvious. In such a light, N.D. librarians come off very badly, especially to anyone who believes there should be parity between library and teaching faculties.

78-79 Average Notre Dame Salary by Rank
(Teaching faculty--9 o. contract;
library faculty--12 mo. contract)

Professor	28016
Librarian	20139
Assoc. prof.	21606
" libr.	15772
Asst. prof.	17063
" libr.	13941
Instructor	14945
Staff libr.	12171

If library salaries are pro-rated according to a 9 mo. year, the difference is even more dramatic.

Prof.	28016
Libr.	15104
Assoc. prof.	21606
" libr.	11829
Asst. prof.	17063
" libr.	10456
Instr.	14945
St. libr.	9128

Several comments should be made regarding these figures. First of all, the director's salary is not included in them. Secondly, though this may look like a ghastly comparison to librarians, it may look about right to many teaching faculty members, especially in the humanities subject areas, where teaching salaries seem to be lower than in the sciences. Their argument would tend to run that librarians have no requirements for doctoral degree or for publication.

Furthermore, in Mrs. Lonie's report on this matter last year, she revealed that in the last five years, while teaching faculty

salaries at N.D. were increased on the average of 5.4% per year, librarians at N.D. received an average annual increase of 7.2% over the same period. Also, a recent Time magazine survey indicates that while librarians have lost a dismal 11.1% in purchasing power due to inflation since 1967, college and university professors have lost even more, 17.5%, in that same time period. These are important statistics to consider in determining whether we will present a case for library faculty salary raises before the Faculty Senate.

Our most significant statistical comparison might be a more detailed and scientific comparison between library and teaching salaries here and at other universities. What checking we were able to do on this particular variable was admittedly only fragmentary. It did seem to indicate, however, that we would find nothing extraordinary if we were able to get statistics like those available to us for Notre Dame. Acquiring the figures would be our main problem, since library ranks vary from place to place and, indeed, are often simply not comparable to teaching faculty academic ranks. Furthermore, it did seem questionable to the committee whether other academic library personnel officers would or should expend themselves very much in order to derive statistical figures fitting into the parameters of our salary survey.

At any rate, any case for raises which would take the specific and vocal approach of closing the gap between teaching and library faculties would broach the topic of parity between the two. Perhaps that would be the proper way for us to go. It would, however, involve a vast project all its own.

What we want from you

We want your views, based on the information in this report, on the following issues:

--Does our faculty have a solid case for salary increases?

--Can and/or should we do anything as a faculty about the two areas in which our salary scale is notably lower than the rest (To do so may require an advocacy position on certain individual salary problems)? If so, what should we do?

--What, if anything, should we as a faculty request of the library administration regarding these matters?

--Did we miss anything?

--And, of course, any other reactions you wish to give us about this issue.

Please feel free to communicate verbally or in writing to any of the committee members. We will make our final recommendations hopefully within one month after our next library faculty meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

The Faculty Affairs Committee,
James Deffenbaugh, Chrmn.
Charlotte Ames
Maureen Gleason
Stephen Hayes

Appendix 1

TABLE 7: AVERAGE SALARIES BY REGION

POSITION	NORTHEAST		NORTH CENTRAL		SOUTH			WEST	
	New England	Middle Atlantic	East N. Central	West N. Central	East S. Central	West S. Central	South Atlantic	Mountain	Pacific
1. Director	38,622	41,607	39,192	35,778	33,628	35,941	36,609	36,836	41,484
2. Associate Director	27,626	31,741	33,120	29,781	26,156	25,818	28,644	27,099	33,355
3. Assistant Director	22,447	24,763	26,270	25,133	19,527	24,167	22,334	22,337	27,910
4. Medical/Law Head	28,996	34,537	29,036	27,247	23,368	26,897	30,792	*	34,821
5. Branch Head	20,595	19,154	18,323	16,672	15,451	16,158	16,817	17,020	20,245
6. Subject Specialist	16,169	16,462	17,290	16,168	15,054	14,894	16,361	16,327	18,790
7. Functional Specialist	18,327	17,232	19,358	20,864	11,291	20,113	17,492	18,990	19,617
8. Dept. Head: Reference	19,063	18,451	17,664	18,152	17,405	17,114	17,659	18,445	21,542
9. Cataloging	19,126	17,794	18,916	17,335	17,490	19,203	18,820	19,713	22,731
10. Acquisitions	18,185	16,730	19,000	18,176	*	15,943	17,827	18,744	23,110
11. Serials	17,950	16,917	16,547	18,005	*	18,280	17,355	16,882	21,322
12. Doc./Maps	18,004	16,800	16,096	16,671	*	15,778	15,627	17,590	21,190
13. Circulation	15,707	16,666	17,076	16,946	14,034	15,749	16,413	16,432	19,407
14. Spec.Cltn.	21,537	19,229	19,548	19,544	15,754	16,490	19,285	23,851	24,307
15. Other	16,999	17,156	17,588	17,698	14,513	16,224	17,789	17,690	22,480
16. Other: Over 15 yrs. experience	15,292	17,941	17,518	16,614	14,020	15,678	15,830	17,403	20,114
17. 10 - 15 yrs. exper.	15,234	15,733	15,434	16,140	13,723	15,503	15,270	15,323	18,572
18. 5 - 9 yrs. exper.	14,458	15,360	14,508	14,439	12,560	14,182	14,293	14,316	16,522
19. Under 5 yrs. exper.	13,038	12,774	12,592	12,493	10,568	12,131	12,339	12,283	14,903

REGION	#[1]	ARL ACADEMIC LIBRARIES	STATES INCLUDED
NORTHEAST			
1. New England	8	Boston; Brown; Conn.; Dartmouth; Harvard; MIT; Yale Massachusetts	Conn., Mass., Me., N.H., R.I., Vt.
2. Middle Atlantic	14	Columbia; Cornell; NYU; Pr.; Pa. State; Pittsburgh; Princeton; Rochester; Rutgers; SUNY: Albany, Buffalo, Stony Brook; Syracuse; Temple;	N.J., N.Y., Pa.
NORTH CENTRAL			
3. East North Central	15	Case Western; Chicago; Cincinnati; Indiana; Ill.; Kent State; Mich.; Mich. State; N. Dame; Northwestern; Ohio State; Purdue; S. Ill.; Wayne State; Wisconsin	Ill., Ind., Mich., Ohio, Wisc.
4. West North Central	7	Iowa; Iowa State; Kansas; Minnesota; Missouri, Nebraska; Wash. U., Mo.;	Iowa, Kan., Minn., Mo., Neb., N. Dak., S. Dak.
SOUTH			
5. East South Central	4	Alabama; Kentucky; Jt. Univ.; Tennessee	Ala., Ky., Miss., Tenn.
6. West South Central	8	Houston; La. State; Oklahoma; Okla. State; Rice; Texas; Texas A&M; Tulane;	Ark., La., Okla., Texas
7. South Atlantic	14	Duke; Emory; Florida; Fla. State; Georgia; Georgetown; Howard; Johns Hopkins; Md.; Miami; N.C.; S.C.; Va.; VPI;	Del., D.C., Fla., Ga., Md., N.C., S.C., Va., W. Va.
WEST			
8. Mountains	6	Arizona; Arizona State; Colorado; Colorado State; Brigham Young; Utah	Ariz., Colo., Idaho, Mont., Nev., N. Mex., Utah, Wyo.
9. Pacific	11	U. of Calif.: Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Barbara; Hawaii; Oregon; Southern Calif.; Stanford; Washington; Washington State;	Alaska, Cal., Hawaii, Oregon, Wash.

* = Salary information not published when fewer than 4 individuals are included.
[1]# = Number of ARL libraries in each region.

LIBRARY STAFF SALARIES

This is one of a number of tables which are being prepared by the Committee Z Washington Office staff. The data tape was obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics, Library Branch. These salaries are on a 12-month basis and are for academic year 1977-78.

TABLE MF-1
Weighted Average Salaries for Full-time Library Staff, by Position, and AAUP Classification,[1] 1977-78

CAA = Chief, Deputy, Associate and Assistant Chief Librarians
OL = All Other Librarians
OP = Other Professional Staff on the Library Budget
TCO = Technical, Clerical, and Other Supporting Staff on the Library Budget
(12-Month Basis)

Position	All Combined[2]	Categories: I*	IIA	IIB	III	IV
			ALL COMBINED			
CAA	$20,640	$23,210	$18,070	$14,070	$18,470	$11,950
OL	15,330	15,380	15,190	13,140	17,490	18,000
OP	12,190	12,570	10,850	8,620	14,440	13,120
TCO	8,340	8,430	8,250	7,000	8,870	8,740
			PUBLIC			
CAA	22,050	24,450	19,700	17,730	18,720	15,650
OL	15,990	15,880	15,900	14,720	17,590	18,000
OP	12,620	12,620	11,610	9,710	14,440	16,040
TCO	8,710	8,690	8,710	8,140	8,920	8,740
			PRIVATE INDEPENDENT			
CAA	21,540	23,210	17,050	14,390	11,350	—
OL	14,490	14,820	13,210	12,440	12,280	—
OP	11,750	12,470	9,380	8,370	—	—
TCO	7,850	8,130	7,540	5,300	6,960	—
			CHURCH-RELATED			
CAA	15,700	18,850	14,240	12,430	13,750	8,260
OL	12,260	12,870	11,980	11,360	12,730	—
OP	10,570	12,440	8,180	7,990	—	5,810
TCO	6,780	7,220	6,450	6,330	6,120	—

[1]Category I—includes institutions which offer the doctorate degree and which conferred in the most recent three years an annual average of fifteen or more earned doctorates covering a minimum of three nonrelated disciplines.
Category IIA—includes institutions awarding degrees above the baccalaureate but not included in Category I.
Category IIB—includes institutions awarding only the baccalaureate or equivalent degree.
Category III—includes two-year institutions with academic ranks.
Category IV—includes institutions without academic ranks. (With the exception of a few liberal arts colleges, this category includes mostly two-year institutions.)
[2]Sample includes 1,557 institutions.
NOTE: Figures have been rounded to the nearest $10.

*Notre Dame belongs in Category I on this chart.

Reprinted with permission of the American Association of University PRofessors from the December, 1978, Academe.

LIBRARY FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

SALARY SURVEY

FINAL REPORT

April 25, 1979

SALARY SURVEY: FINAL REPORT

FORWARD

The report that follows is the second salary survey done by the Library Faculty Affairs Committee. One was done last year under the direction of Ann Lonie.

This report presupposes the committee's preliminary project report, dated Mar. 9, 1979. That report noted 1) that we rank low in salaries among ARL libraries, 2) but that, when compared with other ARL libraries of the east north central region in almost all library job functions (assistant director, department head, etc: cf. Preliminary report, Appendix 1), we were 8% below average or about one year behind. Also noteworthy was that we are far more than 8% below average in two general areas, branch librarians and senior librarians who do not rank as department head or above. Furthermore, as if to add to the already mixed picture presented by the ARL statistics, the report included AAUP library salary statistics (cf. Prel. rpt., Appendix 2) which seemed to indicate that salaries here are competitive, and a comparison, by academic rank, of Notre Dame teaching and library faculties which seemed to show enormous gaps in remuneration levels of comparable academic rankings of the two groups (Prel. rpt., pp. 7-8).

Report

Our main recommendation

In the beginning stages of research and deliberation on the viability of Library Faculty salaries here at Notre Dame, the members of this committee represented no consensus but rather a variety of approaches and predispositions regarding the question

at hand. Now our consensus on the matter is clear. We recommend that the N.D. Library Faculty take no action as a group for salary enhancement of professional library positions here.

We make this recommendation because we believe that there is neither strong evidence nor firm support for such an effort.

First, there does not seem to be dramatic evidence that Library Faculty salaries as a whole are drastically below those of other university librarians in general. Aside from some special situations which will be treated separately in this report, we do not seem to have a strong case. The figures show that we rank very low in salaries compared with other ARL libraries. Yet when the average salaries of the various library positions here at Notre Dame are compared with other ARL libraries in the east north central region, we find that, in most categories, we are only one year behind. Furthermore, when compared with college and university libraries as a whole (AAUP tables), we seem genuinely competitive. So, the solidity of our case becomes less clear the more statistics we have. We do not question that there is, indeed, some argument for increment in salary levels: on at least one representative scale, we rank far below average. But as soon as we begin to detail our case, we find that the presentation of that case would require too many footnotes explaining that various figures are not what they seem. And that is not the strong, glaring argument which is likely to find any credence with the administration or with the teaching faculty.

Second, we do not seem to have strong support among the Library Faculty for a salary enhancement effort. We received five responses to our request (Prel. rpt., p.() for feedback from Library

Faculty members. Three believed no action should be taken; one was ambivalent; and one believed that we have a strong case for salary increases. Also, before we wrote the preliminary report, we talked to two individuals whom we knew to have strongly negative feelings about the salary structure here; and for purposes of analysis, we grouped these with the other five. Aside from that, we have no other response to our request for your reactions regarding the salary question.

There was some consideration of whether we should send to Library Faculty members a questionnaire which would attempt to gauge salary satisfaction or dissatisfaction among librarians. But we decided against that because we concluded that it is far too easy to check a box or circle a number, and that such ease of reply would not necessarily indicate the strenth of support believed essential for a concerted drive by the Library Faculty for salary enhancement. Either there is a ground swell for such an effort or it is doomed not only to failure but to permanent loss of credibility as well. Furthermore, to proceed with this kind of campaign without convinced popular support is all the more questionable when we do not have an outstanding case in the first place. Either way, we believe that such support might have been indicated if many individuals took the time and effort to make specific replies, written or verbal, to our general request for feedback regarding a move for salary enhancement. The ground swell simply does not exist.

This limited support is probably even more significant when one considers that our library director is not in accord with a Library Faculty salary enhancement drive at this time. In a Mar. 28, 1979, memo to one of our committee members, Mr. Miller said:

From my vantage point and my admittedly limited experience it would certainly seem that the University is well aware of the general problems of maintaining an appropriate level for faculty salaries generally and has made significant efforts toward improving the relative competitive position of the University in this area. I know that many universities have not been able to be as generous with raises over the past four years.

As to the Library Faculty situation, my own personal feeling is that our salary levels are in fact generaly competitive and that within the library profession our position is not particularly bad. Obviously inflation has affected us all and I suspect that raises have not in general kept pace with rising prices, but this same factor has affected the teaching-and-research faculty and indeed American wage earners generally --with certain limited exceptions. Based on my brief experience here, I do not think that a special plea for a separate enhancement of Library Faculty salaries would be effective or even particularly appropriate. I think that the Library Faculty should encourage and support University efforts to improve general faculty salaries across the board.

Of course, we do not wish to preclude in principle the possibility of recommending such a drive without the support of the library director. But at this time it is simply a matter of practicality. Any action taken without the support of the director should be based upon dramatic evidence and/or support. In this case we have neither.

Though we recommend no salary enhancement drive by the Library Faculty at this time, we do wish, however, to recommend strongly that any discussion of efforts to improve Notre Dame's position among ARL libraries consider the addition of moneys for both salaries (staff and faculty) and for acquisition of materials, and that, in such a discussion, both areas be considered equally as candidates for additional funding.

Other noteworthy items

One of the more significant discoveries of our committee's research into the N.D. Library Faculty salary schedule was that,

in two general areas, branch librarians and non-administrative librarians with over ten years of experience, our salary averages are substantially below the average of ARL libraries of the east north central region, where Notre Dame is located. In the preliminary report, we noted that the lower-than-average status of these positions could have at least three explanations:

> either there is some built-in injustice in our salary structure; or we are not comparable to other east north central ARL libraries for these levels of librarianship; or there are mitigating circumstances in individual cases.

Of course, we recommend that the library administration examine the internal salary structure for any such built-in inequities and correct the consequent injustices. Also, the members of the committee believe that the individuals who receive salaries sustantially less than the average indicated in Appendix 1 of the preliminary report should be allowed to know, if they wish, which of these three possible explanations applies to them and to what degree.

Mr. Miller, in the Library Faculty meeting of Mar. 21, 1979, announced some procedures regarding this year's salary raises which may, in some cases, correct the problem, and in other cases, clarify the situation for individuals who feel in need of clarification. He noted that he would like to correct or at least improve certain existing salary inequities, to give tangible awards for promotion, and to base annual increment upon job performance. Furthermore, he asks that supervisors discuss openly with their librarians the rationale for individual salary decisions.

Regardless of the positive results these measures may have, the committee wishes to recommend formally that reasons for individual salary status and increments be made readily and honestly

available to those who wish to know them. At the present time, the procedure for such requests for information is that the inquiry should begin with one's immediate supervisor and then continue on up through channels as deemed necessary.

Another area for recommendation by this committee concerns library staff salaries. We do have some statistics, both from the AAUP and from the National Center for Educational Statistics, on average salaries for technical, clerical and other support staff in college and university libraries. We speculate that all but very few of the staff members here at Notre Dame Libraries are paid considerably less than the average presented by the two statistical sources noted above. We tend to believe that the library staff salary situation is dramatically worse than general Library Faculty salary problems. But we do not have the facts of the matter because we were not charged to deal directly with this issue. The committee recommends that a study be done to ascertain the facts, and then that attempts be made to rectify the situation if it is as bad as it appears to be.

Finally, we do not recommend annual surveys and comparative studies of Library Faculty salaries. This committee, with different personnel, has done two such studies in two years. For now, that is enough. Repetition of such studies in the future may be fully merited by changes in library budgeting or general economic conditions and subsequent erosion of the general competitiveness of Notre Dame library salaries; and, at that time, we hope that the necessity for another survey would be based upon evidence of significant support from the Library Faculty itself. For the present, the Library Faculty should be kept informed of Faculty Senate activities on this matter; and the Faculty Affairs Committee

should be prepared to supply to such intitiatives those figures which are already available.

* * *

We believe we should say something about the issue of library faculty parity with teaching faculty. The members of this committee are not in accord as to the desirability of parity with teaching faculty. Furthermore, we did not study this issue directly. Nonetheless, we dealt with related matters enough to say that, regardless of how dramatic and/or persuasive the gaps between teaching faculty salaries and librarians' salaries may appear (cf.Prel.rpt. p.7), a strong case for integration, on all levels, of librarians into the teaching faculty here at Notre Dame seems neither readily apparent nor particulary promising. Futher efforts in this area will have to be decided by the Library Faculty as a whole.

Respectfully submitted,

The Faculty Affairs Committee,
James Deffenbaugh, Chmn.
Charlotte Ames
Maureen Gleason
Stephen Hayes